

DRAFT 6/27/2011 – SUBJECT TO CHANGE
For Review and Adoption by DSC at July 29, 2011 Meeting
DELTA STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL
June 23-24, 2011
West Sacramento City Hall Galleria
1110 West Capitol, Avenue, West Sacramento, California

MEETING SUMMARY

DAY 1: Thursday, June 23, 2011, 9:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

1. Welcome and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 9:02 a.m., June 23, 2011, by Chair Phillip Isenberg.

2. Roll Call – Establish a Quorum (Water Code §85210.5)

Roll call was taken and a quorum was established. The following members were present: Hank Nordhoff, Patrick Johnston, Gloria Gray, Felicia Marcus, Randy Fiorini, Phillip Isenberg, and Don Nottoli.

3. Chair's Report

Chair Isenberg opened the meeting and requested the Council take another look at the staff report for Agenda Item 6, Delta Plan Development, and requested the Council pay particular attention to pages 5 and 6, the suggested motion for the Council's adoption. Chair Isenberg summarized the suggested motion and emphasized the motion was not to adopt a Delta Plan but to revise the fourth staff draft, as appropriate, and to post by mid-July, 2011 a fifth staff draft for public review and comment; and to circulate for public review and comment a draft EIR analyzing the fifth staff draft Plan.

Following the discussion of the proposed motion, Chair Isenberg asked Joe Grindstaff to describe the schedule for the day's meeting. Grindstaff stated there was a request from Council members and stakeholders to spend time talking about "big picture issues." Following the discussion of the "big picture issues" the Council walked through all of the policies and recommendations (changes were made from comments received at the June 16 meeting) working from the Redline Comparison of Policies and Recommendations Chart that were made between the third and fourth staff draft versions of the Delta Plan (Attachment 2). Grindstaff stated it was his hope to walk through Chapters 1, 2, and 3, taking comments from the Council and the public. Chair Isenberg requested that everyone who was going to give public testimony also put their comments in writing, especially if they had specific language suggestions, and send them to the Council.

Grindstaff announced the Delta Protection Commission staff would come before the Council on Friday to present its staff draft of the Economic Sustainability Plan that was released earlier that week. Council Member Nottoli described the schedule for the Plan.

4. Executive Officer's Report

a. Legislative and Legal Update

Curt Miller presented a brief Legislative Update. Miller updated the Council on the State budget situation, explaining in the absence of a budget, the legislators were not being paid. The list of other legislation of interest to the Council was included in the meeting materials.

Debi Ores, the Council's summer legal intern, presented the Legal Update. Ores' update is posted with the meeting materials at http://www.deltacouncil.ca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/files/Item_4a_Legal_Update_2.pdf

It focused on the consolidated Delta Smelt and Salmon cases.

b. Department of Fish and Game Ecosystem Restoration Program Update for 2010 PSP

Joe Grindstaff noted the inclusion of the Department of Fish and Game's Ecosystem Restoration Program (ERP) Proposal Solicitation Package Recommendations. The ERP selection panel met on June 7-8, 2011 to discuss the scientific merit and relevance to ERP priorities of eligible proposals and to make initial funding recommendations to the Director of the Department of Fish and Game. The agenda item laid out the schedule for the PSP, the participants of the selection panel and its funding recommendations. Grindstaff noted that although the Council does not have jurisdiction, it is required by legislation to review all CALFED related expenditures and make recommendations to the Legislature moving forward.

c. Contracts

Joe Grindstaff briefly discussed the Delta Plan contract augmentation that would be brought to the Council for their approval next month. He also said the quarterly listing of the Council's contracts and grants would be provided to the Council at the next meeting as well.

Following the Executive Officer's report and updates, Chair Isenberg called for questions or comments from the public -- there were none.

5. Adoption of April 28-29, 2011, May 12-13, 2011, and June 16, 2011 Meeting Summaries (Action Item)

Joe Grindstaff proposed no action should be taken on the meeting summaries as the Council did not have them in advance to review. The approval of the meeting summaries for April 28-29, May 12-13, and June 16, 2011, were deferred to the July 28-29, 2011 meeting without objection.

6. Delta Plan Development (Note: this item was continued on Friday) (Action Item)

Next was the review and discussion of the fourth staff draft Delta Plan. The requested action was for the Council to direct staff to revise, as appropriate, and to post by mid-July, 2011, a fifth staff draft for public review and comment; and to circulate for public review and comment a draft EIR analyzing the fifth staff draft of the Delta Plan.

This agenda item began with Council Members comments, questions and areas of concern <http://cal-span.org/cgi-bin/archive.php?owner=DSC&date=2011-06-23> (Agenda Item 6,

Timestamp, 38:24). Following this discussion, Joe Grindstaff introduced the overall document and chapters, setting the context for discussion. Grindstaff stated the fourth staff draft of the Delta Plan reflected revisions based on substantial public input and Council direction.

Chair Isenberg asked if there were questions from the public before the Council began an in-depth discussion on each chapter. As there were no questions, the Council heard from individual DSC staff and consultants on each chapter, working from the redline Side-by-Side Comparison of Revised Policies and Recommendations Chart (Attachment 2) <http://www.deltacouncil.ca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/files/REVISED%20Redline%20Comparison%20of%20Policies%20and%20Recommendations%20Between%204th%20and%203rd%20Staff%20Drafts062211a.pdf>. The discussion on the Executive Summary and Chapter 1 was led by Jessica Pearson; Chapter 2 was led by Cliff Dahm and Lindsay Correa; Jessica Pearson led the discussion on Chapter 3; and Martha Davis led the discussion on Chapter 4. The presenters answered the Council's questions, provided clarification and took direction/suggestions from the Council members. The Council discussed Chapters 1-4 with Public Comment heard on each chapter after its presentation.

Chair Isenberg reminded the meeting participants who intended to testify, to also put their comments in writing, especially if they had specific language suggestions, and send them to the Council. All comments received by the Council are posted on the Council's website at <http://www.deltacouncil.ca.gov/public-comments>.

The Council took a lunch break from 12:20 p.m. to 1:10 p.m.

Public Comment – Executive Summary and Chapter 1:

Greg Zlotnick, State and Federal Contractors Water Agency, stated there was a concern with the tenor of the document as a whole, and stated although there is talk of resource development and mention of storage and conveyance, there was feeling in his organization that the tenor was not focused on growing the water supply in California through various mechanisms including those resources developments, improving flexibility, etc. Instead, the draft seemed to be slicing up more of the current pie or reallocating slices of the pie without growing it. Zlotnick also had specific language changes for on the Table of Contents and Chapter 1 that were included in the letter submitted to the Council.

Mark Rockwell, Environmental Water Caucus/Endangered Species Coalition, commented on the Council Members' "big issue discussion" and stated he supported Grindstaff for plain spoken language to articulate goals, objectives and issues needing to be addressed – in all areas, environmental, economic, societal, or otherwise. Rockwell also supported Mr. Fiorini in his request for a 50 year vision of the Delta as a place, ecosystem and water supply. Rockwell also felt that articulating "why bother" was extremely important and felt that Mr. Fiorini's preamble would link those elements together.

Melinda Terry, North Delta Water Agency, stated that she would like to see a balance of good news with the bad and stated there were some good things going on in the Delta in the past and also today. She felt that the document as a whole focused on aquatic species and didn't address other species such as the Pacific Flyway. She also spoke of the good news on subsidence and levees. Terry felt that Delta cultural events should also be described and stated that the Delta residents have most to gain as well as the most to lose and urged the Council to balance the positive with the negative.

Public Comments – Chapter 2:

Anson Moran, Delta Wetlands, commented on adaptive management and stated he felt that adaptive management was incredibly important, and the chapter dealt with it pretty well. Moran stated he was concerned it had the language is directed to policy setting, not implementation. But he felt it was trickier when you tried to take something that is defined in broad terms and apply it to a specific project. Moran urged the Council, as they thought about adaptive management, to leave room for projects that just say what they are going to do...and that should be good enough in some circumstances. He said not everything needs a full blown adaptive management plan. Moran stated he had submitted written comments on this point.

Greg Zlotnick, State and Federal Contractors Water Agency, commented on page 34, and stated the program and the Delta ISB should review current research to see if it was still pertinent to the coequal goals. He stated the science plan issue seems to be an afterthought at the end of the chapter and it seems that the development of a robust science plan should be at the front of the chapter.

Melinda Terry, North Delta Water Agency and Central Valley Flood Control Association, requested including Delta expertise participation in an advisory group, particularly in the area of flood projects and talk of feasibility issues.

Jonas Minton, Planning and Conservation League, said adaptive management should be part of the plan but felt the current presentation was boring. He stated there was not a story yet and the story should highlight “why.” The story should tell how adaptive management is important because of the great uncertainties in the Delta. Then, refer to how it’s done, and peer review should be in a later chapter. Minton stated he felt the use of a common sense examples would be best – coming up with your best shot, trying it on an appropriate scale and learning what happens. Minton stated written comments have been submitted.

Barry Nelson, Natural Resources Defense Council, felt that adaptive management was essential to the success of the Plan. He spoke on the role of experts in decision-making in establishing goals, objectives and recommendations and felt the Council should solicit expertise for each chapter and build in a role for experts in the analysis, synthesis and evaluation phase. Regarding decision-making, Nelson said more meat was needed and that the legislation was clear on adaptive management. He said more clarity about who the decision makers are was needed. Nelson stated written comments were submitted.

Public Comments – Chapter 3:

Pete Kutras, Delta Counties Coalition, commented that he agreed with the comment striking the word “possible” and replacing it with “feasible.” Kutras requested the matrix be posted and asked the date of the July meeting. Regarding the checklist (pg 45, line 19-20) Kutrus stated the Counties would like to see it and also believed it should be part of the plan before the APA review. He also requested clarification on ministerial actions. Kutras felt it would be helpful that the Council recommend to the Legislature that the CEQA statute be harmonized with the covered actions.

Anson Moran, Delta Wetlands, stated his comments had a common theme and there would be permutations that will come before that the Council that they couldn’t anticipate. Moran agreed with the language change from “possible” to “feasible.” He also commented on adaptive management and stated that his point was that the higher you go in the food chain it was

appropriate to have an adaptive management program, but felt on a smaller project the inclusion of adaptive management could be problematic. Moran stated written comments were submitted that included specific language.

Greg Zlotnick, State and Federal Contractors Water Agency, echoed Mr. Nottoli's conversation on the CEQA issue and stated there were differences on the statutory interpretation and he appreciated the inclusion of the one year transfer as exempt. He would also like to have a workgroup to put together a list of items that goes beyond the statute...that would not be covered actions and excluded from the plan. Zlotnick requested clarification about certification (pg. 45, line 41) and suggested adding language to make it clearer.

Osha Meserve, Local Agencies of the North Delta, felt that there was need for a careful approach to consistency and local agency CEQA determinations. She also felt that a focus group for Delta as a Place was a great idea. Meserve stated written comments that included specific language were submitted to the Council.

Tom Zuckerman, Central Delta Water Agency, felt the Plan was vague on the issue of the location of tidal wetlands and requested clarification on consistency determination and felt the plan should be specific and precise. He was concerned with the floating easement the Council was creating and urged caution in this area. He also requested that levee improvement projects on every island should be on a list of projects that wouldn't be considered covered actions.

Linda Dorn, Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District, commented on examples of regulatory actions that would be considered to be exempt as covered actions. Dorn requested clarification if any of the projects used in the example on page 44, line 26, were covered actions. Dorn stated that written comments with specific language were submitted to the Council.

Melinda Terry, North Delta Water Agency and Central Valley Flood Control Association, stated she felt the chapter seemed light. Although it addressed everything in the statute, she didn't see governance when it comes to the implementation phase. She compared it with the BDCP governance document, which had more meat. She saw coordination of the entities as being very important and felt coordination could result in cost savings because of duplication.

Public Comments – Chapter 4:

Doug Wallace, East Bay Municipal Utilities District, felt the chapter highlighted the good faith efforts that water agencies took in conservation, recycling, and alternative supplies although they sometimes still may have had to pursue a transfer. Wallace suggested language changes for the finance section, recommendation 6 and stated he believed the Council should develop a fee structure that the Legislature would have to approve. He felt the public goods charge should be narrow. EBMUD submitted written comments.

Greg Zlotnick, State and Federal Contractors Water Agency, made comments on the bar chart on page 60 that showed comparisons of investments. He stated it gave the impression that the bars were based on the same assumptions across categories of investment and that they were not. Zlotnick felt the chart gave a skewed picture of water investments and suggested a footnote. Zlotnick stated he would forward language. Zlotnick also suggested several language changes throughout the chapter that were included in their letter.

Jonas Minton, Planning and Conservation League, commented on chapter 4, page 66, line 8, updated Delta in-flow criteria. Minton stated the policy switched in line 16 and referred the Council to chapter 5, page 88, line 7. Minton commented on updated (new) flow standards and

asked how can a project be designed, analyzed, or financed when “how much water it can deliver” is unknown? Minton recommended that the Council add language recommending the Water Board establish new Delta flow standards by 6/30/14 and a policy stating that large scale programs that can’t be financed/implemented at one time, phasing should be implemented in ways that will achieve incremental progress and allow learning along the way. Minton showed a slide with suggested language that had been submitted to the Council.

Ryan Bezerra, Bartkiewicz, Kronick & Shanahan, stated he was concerned with changes from the third to the fourth staff draft and felt that some the changes in chapter 4 introduced significant internal inconsistencies regarding policy 2 and recommendation 3. Bezerra stated the changes from the third to the fourth staff draft policy and recommendations did not work well together and he felt this was a significant problem.

7. Public Comment

Chair Isenberg asked if there were any members of the public wishing to address the Council.

Anson Moran, Delta Wetlands, commented on chapter 5, as he would not be able to attend the next day’s meeting. Moran stated he was uncomfortable with ER P2 and the way it was used. Moran had suggested language for the Policy that was included in his written comments submitted to the Council.

Prior to the conclusion of the meeting, Mr. Nordhoff stated he would be leaving for China the next day and would be unable to attend the second day of the meeting (June 24, 2011). He requested the Council permit him to cast a recorded vote on the suggested staff motion contained in the staff report for Agenda Item 6. Member Johnston then made that motion – seconded by Member Gray - which is as follows:

The Council directs staff to take all of the following actions:

- 1. Schedule the November Council meeting for consideration of certification of the final EIR and adoption of the Delta Plan, contingent upon prior completion of the CEQA process and meeting the APA rulemaking requirements.**
- 2. Pursuant to the Council’s direction at this meeting, revise the fourth staff of the Draft Delta Plan, and prepare a new staff draft. The new draft will be referred to as the fifth staff draft of the Delta Plan. As soon as possible thereafter, post the fifth staff draft of the Delta Plan on the Council’s website for public review and comment.**
- 3. When ready, circulate for a 45-day public review and comment period a draft EIR under CEQA analyzing the environmental impacts of the fifth staff draft of the Delta Plan and a reasonable range of alternatives thereto.**
- 4. Post on the Council’s website as soon as possible, a detailed schedule and timeline of future actions related to CEQA and the APA rulemaking processes to facilitate final Council votes as referred to in #1 above.**
- 5. Up until the formal circulation and commenting periods in this motion, continually post draft charts, tables or other graphic information proposed for inclusion in the draft Delta Plan, together with any suggested changes in style, grammar or writing that staff proposes.**

Chair Isenberg opened the roll and Mr. Nordhoff voted aye. The motion remained pending and the roll was held open for subsequent votes.

The meeting concluded for the day at 5:30 p.m.

DAY 2: Friday, June 24, 2011, 9:00 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.

8. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m., Friday, June 24, 2011, by Chair Phillip Isenberg, and operated as a subcommittee with members Gloria Gray, Randy Fiorini and Phillip Isenberg present.

9. Roll Call – Establish Quorum (Water Code §85210.5)

Roll call was taken and a quorum was established at 9:12 a.m. The following members were present: Patrick Johnston, Gloria Gray, Felicia Marcus, Randy Fiorini, Phillip Isenberg, and Don Nottoli. Absent: Hank Nordhoff.

10. Lead Scientist's Report

Cliff Dahm, Lead Scientist, updated the Council on the activities of the Science Program and highlighted several scientific papers that were recently accepted to a scientific peer-review journal. Dahm also briefed the Council on highlights from his participation at the annual meeting of the North American Benthological Society.

Delta Protection Commission's First Administrative Draft of the Economic Sustainability Plan for the Sacramento San Joaquin Delta

The Delta Protection Commission released its First Administrative Draft of the Economic Sustainability Plan for the Sacramento San Joaquin Delta (<http://www.delta.ca.gov/res/docs/Draft%20ESP%20June%202023.pdf>). Executive Director, Mike Machado introduced the agenda item by describing the legislation that called for the study, which was focused on protecting and enhancing the resources of the Delta as well as the industries that were related to the Delta's natural resources such as water recreation and agriculture. Following Machado's introduction, Jeff Michael, David Sunding and Robert Pyke presented a PowerPoint, posted at http://www.deltacouncil.ca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/files/DPC_Presentation.pdf

11. Delta Plan Development (Continuation of Agenda Item 6)

This item was continued from Thursday. Chapter 5 was presented by Lauren Hastings, Anke Muller-Solger, Chris Enright and Dave Zezulak (DFG). Chapter 6 was presented by Sam Harader; Eric Nichol presented Chapter 7; Gwen Buchholz and Allan Highstreet presented Chapter 8; and Eric Nichol presented Chapter 9. The Council worked through the chapters using the Redline Version of the Side-by-Side Comparison of Revised Policies and Recommendations Chart <http://www.deltacouncil.ca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/files/REVISED%20Redline%20Comparison%20of%20Policies%20and%20Recommendations%20Between%204th%20and%203rd%20Staff%20Drafts062211a.pdf>, and public comment was heard on each chapter before moving to the next. Chair Isenberg reminded the meeting participants who gave public testimony, to put their comments in writing, especially if they had specific language suggestions,

and send them to the Council. All comments that are sent to the Council are posted at <http://www.deltacouncil.ca.gov/public-comments>.

The Council recessed for lunch at 12:30, returned at 1:10 p.m. and resumed the discussion of the remaining chapters.

Prior to the lunch recess, Member Gray indicated that she would be unable to attend the remainder of the meeting and therefore cast an aye vote on the pending motion for Agenda Item 6.

Public Comment – Chapter 5:

Phil Pogledich, Yolo County, made four suggestions on chapter 5 and related topics that were included in the written comments submitted by the County. He commented on ER R2 requesting that it be turned into a policy. He also stated he felt it seemed premature to prioritize habitat projects that were still conceptual. Pogledich also commented on the loss of farmland that would be converted to habitat and the economic impacts on the County. He stated he felt the County's general plan was consistent with the coequal goals and urged a more measured approach.

Jessica Ludy, American Rivers, felt the modifications on chapter 7, from the third to the fourth staff draft were a step back in the ability to reduce risk in the Delta. She stated the Council should establish goals and objectives for how the Delta Plan could reduce risk in the Delta rather than deferring to the DWR. Ludy suggested it would be helpful if a category on table 7-1 were added to identify the depth of inundation upon levee failure. Ludy stated written comments were provided.

Kathy Barnes-Jones, Solano County Resource Management Department, felt there was no clear process for local government involvement and recommended a joint effort to work together. Barnes-Jones stated Solano County was submitting written comments that contained a recommendation for a consultation process that would bring together the state and local government.

Greg Zlotnick, State and Federal Contractors Water Agency, supported the language change on the natural flow regime. He also commented on several recommendations in the chapter that were included in their written comments. He stated he was curious about Minton's suggestion and was concerned with halting good activities.

Melinda Terry, North Delta Water Agency and Central Valley Flood Control Association, stated the language was better in this draft but felt the plan was still aquatic-centric rather than terrestrial. On the vegetation issue, she complimented DWR for development of an alternative that has been submitted to the Army Corps of Engineers. She urged the Council to write to the Corps to request the alternative California has put forward and had concern that the RD's won't be able to comply by 2012. She also mentioned that new reports on levee vegetation had been completed and may be helpful. Terry also stated that there were several maps available on the DPC website that would be helpful to use in the chapter. Terry made several comments on the recommendations and policies and had suggested language changes.

Linda Dorn, Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District, made comments on ER R8, pg 13 and requested that the Sanitation District be included as a relevant agency. Dorn commented

on other stressors and felt a work group to address cost benefits would be beneficial. Dorn stated they have submitted written comments that included language recommendations.

Brian Campbell, East Bay Municipal Utilities District, commented on ER P1 and stated they were supportive of the approach in the fourth staff draft. EBMUD has submitted written comments.

Ryan Bezerra, Bartkiewicz, Kronick & Shanahan, commented on the flow piece and felt the Council should be careful on the language used regarding implementing flow standards by 2014, and stated he felt a better recommendation would be to tell DWR to do something on flow standards versus asking the State Board to fix it. Bezerra also commented on the need to change the flow discussion to what was currently happening.

Public Comment – Chapter 6:

Greg Zlotnick, State and Federal Contractors Water Agency, thanked Grindstaff for following up on the salinity issue. He also questioned why a full paragraph was devoted to the X2 section (pg 108, line 30 on) when it was still under litigation. Zlotnick commented on pg 113, line 13-18 and suggested deleting the sentence (line 15-18). Specific written language was included in their letter submitted to the Council.

Linda Dorn, Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District, commented on the covered actions. Dorn felt water quality and water supply were interconnected and appreciated the rewritten chapter. Dorn commented on the performance measures, page 120-121, lines 36-38, and suggested that there not be a specific number specified at this time. Dorn stated that suggested language changes were included in their comment letter.

Following public comment on Chapter 6, Member Marcus indicated that she would be unable to attend the remainder of the meeting, and therefore cast an aye vote on the pending motion on Agenda Item 6.

Public Comment – Chapter 7:

Gil Cosio, MBK Engineers, commented on the types of levees described in the plan and felt that they did not appear to have levee standards for levees that convey water. Cosio questioned what standard the Council would use. Cosio also briefly discussed set-back levees and their purpose and problems. He also commented on figure 7.1, HMP standards for levees.

Osha Meserve, Local Agencies of the North Delta, commented on table 7-1. Meserve felt that the chapter needed to be much clearer on how it relates to covered actions versus non-covered actions and wondered if it was going to be tied to RR P3. Meserve stated she thought this would be a good section of a focus group, and once worked out, it should be described accurately – and suggested that possibly another table would be needed for that issue. Meserve also commented on RR R4 and questioned the Council's definition of "feasible" when a set-back levee was going to encroach on a lot of property.

Pete Kutras, Delta Counties Coalition, commented on table 7-1 and noted on the June 14th version, class 1 was empty and Kutras felt that agriculture was acceptable. Kutras requested clarification on Class 3 under legacy 10. He also requested the Council add a footnote on both that column and the next.

Greg Zlotnick, State and Federal Contractors Water Agency, stated he appreciated that there is a lot of information on risk reduction. He had a concern that §85306 had not been clearly spelled out. Pg 150, lines 10-12, regarding performance measures, Zlotnick felt more specificity was needed. Written comments were been submitted to the Council.

Melinda Terry, North Delta Water Agency and Central Valley Flood Control Association, appreciated the changes in the Chapter. Terry stated the Delta Levees Subvention Program had a sunset clause of 2012 because it was waiting for the Delta Plan and believed the Plan should have something in it about extending the program. Terry also had comments on several of the pages and the policies and recommendations. Terry stated suggested language was submitted in their written comments and encouraged the Council to look at her comments on the third staff draft about FEMA.

Public Comment – Chapter 8 and Chapter 9

Greg Zlotnick, State and Federal Contractors Water Agency, requested clarification as to where the dollar figures came from in the Chapter and felt if numbers were going to be used that it was important to show where they came from. Zlotnick also requested the reference to user fees (pg 173, lines 12-26) be deleted and stated the same applied to public discharge.

Melinda Terry, North Delta Water Agency and Central Valley Flood Control Association, felt that chapter 8 needed to be beefed up. Terry was concerned that funding has to be secure before moving forward with assessments. Terry stated she was still not sure where the Council was going with the goals and objectives and requested they be more clearly defined.

Scott Hudson, San Joaquin County Agricultural Commissioner's Office, commented on chapter 8 and stated that agriculture was very important to the County and felt there were issues that needed to be addressed in the Plan. Hudson stated that the Plan needed to keep agriculture profitable and had concerns with converting agricultural land to habitat restoration. Hudson requested clarification as to how and where land would be converted, what the acquisition process would be and felt the Plan needed to develop an acquisition process. He also wondered how agricultural land next to habitat would be protected from pests, disease as well as native species.

Mel Lytle, San Joaquin County, stated the County would provide a letter on specific comments. The County was focused on water resources, groundwater issues and flood control issues. Lytle commented on WR P2, stating that he felt there was no significant discussion of drought planning and wondered where it fit in the Delta Plan.

Linda Dorn, Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District, stated she agreed with the deletion of user fees, stressor fees, etc. Dorn felt it would bring an unfair economic burden on the Sacramento region.

Melinda Terry, North Delta Water Agency and Central Valley Flood Control Association, had several maps that she felt should be included in the Plan. Chair Isenberg requested she give the maps to Gwen Buchholz to review for possible inclusion.

14. Public Comment

Chair Isenberg asked if there were any members of the public wishing to address the Council and comments were provided by:

Nicole Suard, Snug Harbor Resorts, was present earlier but was not able to stay for the public comment period, but submitted written comments regarding the background science used to develop the Draft Delta Plan, including the fourth staff draft.

Following the public comment period, Chair Isenberg restated the pending motion on Agenda Item 6, and noted that Members Nordhoff, Gray and Marcus had already cast aye votes prior to their respective departures from the meeting, and that the roll had been kept open for voting at the conclusion of the meeting.

Members Isenberg, Fiorini, Johnston, and Nottoli voted aye, and together with the previous aye votes of Members Nordhoff, Gray and Marcus, the motion was adopted (7/0).

15. Preparation for Next Council Meeting – Discuss (a) expected agenda items; (b) new work assignments for staff; (c) requests of other agencies; (d) other requests from Council members; and (e) confirm next meeting date – July 28-29, 2011 Council Meeting that will be held at the West Sacramento City Hall Galleria.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:57 p.m.